



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bleremina mees belongs here, too, though the interpretation is apparently corrupt, at any rate unintelligible. To the line *patam liganam sennas atque michanas (mysteras, Cock.)*, I would refer the *liganā* (reading of *b*) *zunga*, *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 430, 36 and Erfurt³ (C. G. L. ii, 588, 52) *pata frons*. To *cladam, crassum* (read *capsum*), *madianum, talias*, I believe refers the *sasan* appearing *WW.* 200, 36 after *casses retia uel*. Pogatscher would make *cassan* the plural of *casse*, an alleged Anglicized *cassis*, but *WW.* 365, 15 *cassan beost* (read *capsum breost*) shows plainly that two glosses have been run together, viz. *casses retia uel . . . capsum*.⁵ . . .

To the same line refers *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 431, 3 *taliaslenden* to *pupillis, rotis, palpebris, tautonibus* refers *Ahd. Gl.* iii 430, 20 *tautonibus* *ouer . . . To *capitali centro, cartilagini* refer *WW.* 202, 43, *ceruellum i. centrum* (read *centrum. i. cerebellum*) *brægen*. *Centrum* seems to be a Celtic coinage from Irish *cen* 'head' denoting 'that which is in the head,' cf. O. Ir. *inchin* 'brains.' To the line *marsim, reniculos, fethrem cum obligia* is to be referred *WW.* 239, 14 *fither snædelpearne* and the *Epinal-Erfurt* (C. G. L. v. 376, 3) *obligia nettæ (nectæ) — Corpus O* 147. To the line *tege tolian thoracum cum pulmone* refer *Ahd. Gl.* iii 431, 6 *torax grecum hoc est brustlappa* and *WW.* 203 11 [*thorax i.*] *centumcilio. i. pellis feleferð uel centumpellis*. The interpretation *feleferð* which is identical with the *felo fearth* (*Epinal*), *felufreth* (*Erfurt*), *feolufserð* (*Corpus*) glossing *torax* (C. G. L. v. 397, 4) renders it probable that *WW.* 203, 11 *centumcilio* is not the original lemma, but rather *thorax*, and that the glosses quoted are related. For the meaning of *feleferð* cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii 321, 82 *omasus fileart* (read *filefalt* with Steinmeyer) and *WW.* 610, 38 *scruta exta. i. tripe, the felvelde* Mr. Sweet makes of it a bird, the fieldfare! Of the glosses taken from the *Hisperica Famina* and the *Lorica*, I expect to say more at some later time. I will conclude with drawing attention to a very ludicrous 'ghostword'

⁵ Cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 638, 5 *torax brunie ⁊ cassida* with which latter Steinmeyer brings together Italian *casso* 'breast,' as he does *cassa spunerunst* *ibid.* iii 496, 42. Cf. also in the Luxembourg Folio, p. 1, no 54, *crasici* (= *cassici* = *capici*) *peftoralis*. *Revue Celtique* 1, 348.

⁶ Cp. also *Erfurt* (C. G. L. v. 393, 31) *tautone palpebrae — Epinal* (*tautonæ*) = *Corpus T* 34 (*tautonæ*).

Sweet has taken over from Hall, though the latter gives his source, and that might have enabled the learned veteran to correct the evident error. Hall prints *puerisc* 'boyish' *WW.* 528, 30 (Lat.) The gloss appears among those taken from Aldh. *de Laud. Virginum* and it would have been easy to find in Giles' edition, p. 182, the passage referred to, *Musica Pierio resonent et carmina cantu* and to see that *puerisc* is a slight mistake for *piuerisc* 'Pierian.' There are many other errors Sweet has accepted on Hall's authority, but of that later.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford, Conn.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Don Quixote de la Mancha. Primera Edición del texto restituído. Con Notas y una Introducción por JAIME FITZMAURICE-KELLY y JUAN ORMSBY. 2 vols. Edimburgo: Constable; Londres: 1898, 1899. David Nutt, Editor. 4,^o lx, 510 pp. and xiii, 556 pp.

La Celestina por Fernando de Rojas, conforme á la Edición de Valencia de 1514, Con una Introducción del Dr. D. M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO. 2 vols. Vigo Librería de Eugenio Krapf, 1899, 1900. 8vo, lvi, 237 pp. and pp. 238-470, with a bibliography.

AT last a truly critical edition of the Cervantes' immortal work has appeared, and is published with a magnificence of which its author—struggling all his life with most persistent poverty—certainly never even dreamed. And yet, after waiting nearly three hundred years, it was reserved for two English scholars to bring out a definitive edition and to publish it in Scotland. Grateful as every Spaniard must be for this truly magnificent and scholarly work, he cannot help but feel a twinge of regret that the great masterpiece of the Castilian tongue should have found no one in the land of its birth who could or would competently edit it. The glory of Spanish literature has received its final form at the hands of strangers.

This edition is truly a monumental one, for in addition to the thorough scholarship with which the text has been handled, it is also one of the most beautiful specimens of printing

that I have ever seen. The editors, Mr. John Ormsby and Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly are two of the most distinguished Spanish scholars in England. Mr. Ormsby¹ has made the best English translation of *Don Quixote* that has yet appeared, and is also known by his spirited translation of the *Poema del Cid* and various essays on Spanish literature, while Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly is the author of an excellent life of Cervantes and of a Manual of Spanish Literature² that is incomparably the best that has yet appeared. It would be hard indeed to find two more competent *Cervantistas*, and the high regard in which these scholars are held in the literary world is entirely justified by the edition of *Don Quixote* which they have produced. The Introduction of the editors (written in Spanish), which is a history of the text and a justification of their treatment of it, is most clear and convincing. They say:

"In this edition of *Don Quixote* we have tried to present the text freed from arbitrary alterations introduced by our predecessors."

They show that there were five editions of *Don Quixote* published in 1605.³ The printing of the *editio princeps* was finished on Dec. 1, 1604, and must have been offered for sale at the beginning of 1605. It was a very poorly printed book, for Cervantes not having sufficient means to publish the work at his own expense, had sold his author's rights to Francisco de Robles, printer to the King, and Robles sent the manuscript to the press of Juan de la Cuesta.

Doubtful of the success of the book, Robles spent as little as possible upon it. The manuscript had, moreover, passed through many hands before it reached those of Cuesta. Two months before its impression Lope de Vega spoke of it to the Duke of Sesa as of a book which both knew well, and as Lope spoke disparagingly of it, it did not strengthen the hope of the printer in its success. Nevertheless, the

¹ Mr. Ormsby died, as we learn from the Introduction, when only twenty-five chapters of Part I had been edited.

² We are promised both a French and a Spanish translation of this work. Let us hope it may not be long delayed.

³ There was probably also an edition published at Barcelona in 1605, as Cervantes speaks of it, and it was the habit of the Barcelonense, Sebastian de Cormellas to reprint every good work the same year that it appeared.

book met with immediate favour, and Robles, who had at first only obtained a *privilegio* for Castile, was not long in obtaining one for Aragon and Portugal, and brought out another edition (the *privilegio* dated Feb. 9, 1605), which was followed by two fraudulent editions in Lisbon—one by Jorge Rodriguez, with a license dated Feb. 26, 1605, and one by Pedro Crasbeek, (licensed Mar. 27, 1605); and, finally, another edition appeared at Valencia by Pedro Patricio Mey, with an *aprobación* dated July 18, 1605. This shows clearly how eagerly the work was received.

It will be seen that only three months elapsed between the first and second editions issued by Robles, and the hurry with which this second Madrid edition was gotten out may be seen in the two striking errors on the very title-page, although some of the oversights and errors of the first edition are here corrected. Still, Cervantes, as the editors say, had no part whatever in this matter, for he was living at Valladolid, three or four days journey from Madrid, and lack of time did not admit of the proofs passing from one city to another. Besides, at that time, after an author had sold his rights to the printer or editor, he had no control whatever over his work, or any right to intervene for the purpose of amending or correcting it.

As Lope says in the "Prologue to the Reader" in *Parte xvii* of his *Comedias* "*una vez pagados los ingenios del trabajo de sus estudios, no tenían accion sobre ellas.*" The complaints made by contemporary writers show the frequent abuse of editorial power, and the corrections or rather changes made in the second edition of *Don Quixote* prove that these complaints did not lack foundation. The editor gives a number of examples of these changes, due chiefly to the stupidity of the editor:—the *murassen y tapiassen* in Chap. vii changed to *mudassen*; in Chap. xxiii *los siete macabeos* changed to *los siete Mancebos*, and a number of others, all of much importance for a comprehension of the text.

Bowle, as early as 1777, knew of these two Madrid editions of 1605, a fact that was unknown to the Spanish Academy when it published its edition three years later, taking the second edition for the first, and believing it to

be the only one published by Robles in that year. Pellicer did the same thing and was followed by Clemencin. The Spanish Academy did not recognize its error till the appearance of its fourth edition in 1819. It seems that Hartzenbusch, in 1863, first observed the important textual differences between the two first editions. Concerning the edition of 1608, which has by some been held to have been corrected by the hand of Cervantes, the editors note that it was Pellicer who first ascribed especial authority to this edition.

"He presumed that when the Court was moved from Valladolid to Madrid in 1606, that Cervantes also migrated thither, and he says ingenuously that two years later Cervantes determined to reprint his *Ingenioso Hidalgo*, a matter that was as much beyond his power as were the conditions of peace in the Netherlands."

There is not a bit of evidence to prove that Cervantes was living at Madrid in 1608, and "no one has yet been bold enough to assert that Cervantes corrected the proofs being absent from Madrid." Moreover, as we have seen, Cervantes, having parted with his rights to Robles for the period of ten years, he had no authority whatever to prepare a new edition. In fact the editors subsequently show clearly that Cervantes was not resident or present in Madrid in 1608, although he resided there from 1609 until his death. The alleged authority of this edition therefore falls. It is also shown that it is very likely that Cervantes never saw any other edition except the first, and that the only text, therefore, that possesses authority is the *editio princeps*.

"This, like the others, did not have the advantage of having been printed under the care of the author, and it may be that the copyist and the printer made mistakes now and then. But for this there is no remedy. What can be remedied is the injustice that has been done to Cervantes by attributing to him absurdities that he never wrote, nor which he ever could have written, and that have brought upon him the reputation of writing an obscure and careless style."

So much for the first part of *Don Quixote*. Concerning the second part, the state of affairs is quite different. There can be no dispute here upon the authority of the text.

"Cervantes likewise transferred his rights to Robles, who published an edition, and no

other appeared during the lifetime of the author, nor does anyone pretend that there existed a posthumous edition corrected by the author in his last days."

The editors call attention to the more favourable conditions under which this second part was written. Cervantes was no longer an unknown author struggling with poverty; "the vagabond of former years, without a roof and without credit." The success of the first part of *Don Quixote* had made him famous; his name had been carried beyond the Pyrenees, and "gave him importance in the eyes of the Madrid booksellers." Cervantes wrote this part deliberately; here, as the editors say, "his style is truly his, clear and without the circumlocution and the laboured latinized phrase of the school then in fashion." Besides, Cervantes was residing in Madrid, and could be consulted by Robles, "though there is no reason for supposing that author and editor demanded a pedantic exactitude of text."

The principles that have guided the editors in the construction of the text is contained in the statement that

"the only sure road to follow is to admit no emendation whatever, however ingenious it may be, when a reasonable presumption exists that the author wrote the word or words that appear in the primitive text."

This principle has been strictly adhered to, though the lawless orthography of the first edition has been corrected, the punctuation has been revised, the text re-distributed in paragraphs, and the dialogue has been so arranged that the different parts are readily discernable.

It is safe to say that the edition of Mr. Ormsby and Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, based upon the *editio princeps* and printed with the utmost care and exactitude, is the definitive edition of *Don Quixote*, from which all future editions must take their text. The editors have conferred an enduring favour upon all students of Spanish literature, for which they should feel deeply grateful.

After *Don Quixote* there can be scarcely a doubt that the next greatest work in Spanish literature is the *Celestina*, though perhaps it is to be feared that this is a work more talked

and written about than read. Menéndez y Pelayo, the editor of the edition before us, and the most learned of Spanish critics, says :

"In our opinion the *Celestina* is one of the most genial and extraordinary works that the literature of any nation can show, and the work which, perhaps, amongst those produced upon our soil, merits the second place after the *Ingenioso Hidalgo*."

Of course without direct access to the earliest impressions a critical and final edition of the *Celestina* is impossible, but it is certainly a strange coincidence that this first attempt at improving the text and furnishing the variants of other editions, should appear in the same year with the *Don Quixote* mentioned above. Though the editor is the first of Spanish critics, the printer is a German, like so many early printers of Spain, and like many of them, he has produced a book which, typographically, and in everything that goes to make a book beautiful, is a work of surpassing excellence.

And it does not issue from the press of Madrid, with its Ginestas, Fortanets and Aribaus, but from the small Galician town of Vigo—a place quite unknown in the annals of Spanish printing. The text here given is based upon the edition of Valencia, 1514, which is supposed to be a reproduction of the lost Salamanca edition of 1500. How closely this text represents the text of 1500, of course we do not know.⁴ It is preceded by a critical study of the *Celestina* by Don. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, now the director of the National Library at Madrid. It is, in the main, the same luminous and searching study with which we are already acquainted, but it appears here newly corrected and augmented, a model of clear and beautiful style which other Spanish critics would do well to imitate.

In his discussion of the authorship of the *Celestina*, Menéndez y Pelayo rejects entirely the theory that the first Act was written by either Juan de Mena or Rodrigo Cota. The pedantic prose of the former, full of inversions and latinisms, shows that it is utterly impossible that he should have written the *Celestina*. Concerning Rodrigo Cota, the

author of the beautiful *Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo*, we unfortunately have no prose that he has written, and the editor's argument is not so convincing. In his opinion Fernando de Rojas is

"the sole author and creator of *La Celestina*, which he composed, not in a fortnight, but in many days, months and even years, in all conscience, tranquility and repose, never wearying of correcting and filing it, as the numerous variants of all the editions which we can suppose to have been made during his life prove,—variants which concern the first Act as well as the remaining ones."

And again the editor remarks :

"The identity of style in all the parts of the *Celestina*—the serious as well as the humorous ones—is such that in spite of the respectable opinion of Juan de Valdés to the contrary, it has been repeatedly pointed out by critics."

Menéndez, however, finds a deeper reason—one which in his opinion utterly precludes the possibility of the first Act having flowed from a different pen from that which wrote the succeeding ones, and that is the admirable unity of thought that pervades the whole work ; the constancy and fixedness in the delineation of the characters ; the logical and gradual development of the story, and the complete mastery with which Rojas controls his material ;—not like one who continues the work of another, but like one who disposes freely of his own work. Finally, summing up, he says :

"We believe then that the *Celestina* is the work of a single author who can be no other than the batchelor Fernando de Rojas, a native of La Puebla de Montalbán, Alcalde Mayor of Salamanca, and finally an inhabitant of Talavera de la Reina."

In discussing the origin of the *Celestina*, Menéndez y Pelayo states that its true prototype is to be sought in an unrepresentable Latin comedy of the twelfth century, the *Pamphilius de Amore*, freely imitated in Castilian verse by the Archpriest of Hita.

"It is the *Trota-conventos* of the Archpriest which is the true ancestor of the *Celestina*, and to no one of his predecessors did Fernando de Rojas owe so much as to the Archpriest of Hita."

For the dialogue, however, he was in all probability indebted to the *Corbacho* of another Archpriest—Alfonso Martínez of Toledo, Arch-

⁴ See now, for the bibliography of the *Celestina* the articles of Foulché-Delbosc in the *Revue Hispanique*, vol. vii, which has appeared since the above was written.

priest of Talavera, who composed his satire in the time of John II. (1438).

So far as the authorship of the *Celestina* is concerned, however, we may say that more than forty years ago,⁵ Ferdinand Wolf had arrived at the same conclusion as Menéndez, and Wolf likewise makes the comparison with the *Corbacho* of Alfonso Martínez de Toledo.⁶

The authorship being definitely settled we come to the question of the bibliography of the *Celestina*, and there is nothing but doubt and uncertainty so far as the first edition is concerned. When was the *Celestina* first printed? At Burgos in 1499 by Fadrique Aleman of Basle? Or is the edition of Salamanca, 1500, now lost, the first one?

Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, than whom there is no better authority on this point, and whose aid has been invoked by the publisher, Señor Krapf, in the compilation of the Bibliography contained in Vol. ii, speaks very guardedly concerning this 1499 edition. In his Introduction to Mabbe's translation of the *Celestina* he says "if that be the true date," and later in his *History of Spanish Literature*, using the words "as it seems"—in both cases leaving room for plenty of doubt.

The copy described by Brunet is the Heber copy, which passed into the possession of M. de Soleinne, and then found its way into the library of Baron Seillière and when, after the latter's death, his books were sold, in 1890 it passed into the hands of Mr. Quaritch. See the *Catalogue de livres rares et précieux*, etc., composant la Bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron Acl. S. Paris, 1890, No. 584, in which we find the statement: "*Salvâ, donnant dans son Catalogue la description de notre exem-*

⁵ *Zur Geschichte der Spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*, Berlin, 1859, p. 297.

⁶ Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in his introduction to Mabbe's translation of the *Celestina*, London, 1894, had expressed himself as follows:

"But if Rojas did not read it (Pamphilus, De Amore) he may have found the germ of his story in the *Libro de Cantares* of Juan Ruiz, who names his sources with characteristic candor: *lo feo del estoria dis Pánfilo e Nasón*: indeed the Trotaconventos of the Archpriest of Hita, mentioned by Parmeno in the second Act, is as surely the rough sketch of the Bawd as Don Melon de la Uerta and Doña Endrina de Calatayud are anticipations of the lovers. And from the *Corbacho* of a second learned cleric, Alfonso Martínez de Talavera, Rojas not only lifted some passages bodily, but further, conveyed the usage of popular proverbs and catch-words, which he developed with a will and a profusion unsurpassed by Cervantes himself." P. xiii.

plaire, déclare que c'est la suele qu'il con-
*naisse."*⁷

There seems, therefore, to be but one copy of this edition known, the original Heber copy, lately in the possession of Mr. Quaritch. Upon the last page of this copy is the legend: *NIHIL SINE CAUSA. 1499. F. A. de Basilea*, with the wood-cut mark of this well-known printer, also a German. Now this last page, Brunet says, has upon it the water mark "1795." It is on this account that the whole book has been considered by some to be a forgery. But, why may not this last page merely have been supplied in fac-simile, and the text still be genuine? Another copy *may* have existed at the close of the last century or at the beginning of our own. There is nothing so unreasonable about this. Books very easily disappear, and even manuscripts—generally much more closely guarded, also vanish. Mr. Libri, we all know, caused many of them to do so, and at least one very important manuscript disappeared a few years ago from the very vigilant guardianship of the custodians of the British Museum. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, writing to me some time ago, expressed himself as follows:

"Not having seen the 1499 ed. I cannot bluntly call it a forgery. The forged date is suspicious, but that might be forged and the *text* might belong to 1499, the leaf being inserted to make good a defect, etc. But the fact of the forgery does not stand alone. There are other facts: that a 1499 *Celestina* is never heard of till 1837; that Quaritch would let nobody see it; that now, having sold it—as he alleges—he refuses to disclose the purchaser's name. None of these circumstances is conclusive, if taken alone; taken together they tell against the authenticity of the book. But I cannot positively say it is absolutely unauthentic till I have seen it; nor, so far as I can see, can anybody else."

There are, however, a number of presumptions in favour of the authenticity of the Burgos ed. of 1499, or at least in favour of an earlier edition than that of Salamanca, 1500. Fadrique Aleman, the printer of the first edition of the Chronicle of the *Cid*, was a well known publish-

⁷ There was a sale of some of Baron Seillière's books in London in 1887, but after tracing a number of other extremely rare books which Quaritch says he purchased at the Seillière sale in Paris in 1890, there can be little doubt that the above catalogue is composed entirely of books that once formed part of the Seillière collection.

er in Burgos at that time. The 1499 text contains but sixteen Acts—which follow each other logically—and seventeen wood-cuts; the lost edition of Salamanca, 1500, as deduced from the editions of Valencia, 1514 and 1518, already contained the whole twenty-one Acts, and probably also had the twenty-two wood-cuts that all copies of the complete work seem to have contained down to the Venice edition of 1534. There can be scarcely a doubt in the mind of any one who reads the work carefully that the edition of sixteen Acts is the older rescension, and that the additional five Acts, which first appear in the Salamanca edition of 1500, have been merely interpolated between Acts 14 and 15 of the original. All the editions from 1502 to 1534 followed the 1502 Seville edition, as the omission of the stanzas "*Penados Amantes*" show. The edition of 1501 was not followed.

All these editions except the *princeps* contain twenty-one Acts. But lately two editions have come to light which follow the 1499 Burgos edition, and contain only sixteen Acts. M. Foulché-Delbosc discovered one (Seville, 1501), in the Bibliothèque National, at Paris, and has just reprinted it.⁸ In addition to this the Marqués de Jerez de los Caballeros has lately come across an edition, also in sixteen Acts, printed at Seville, 1502. These discoveries, naturally, suggest anew a whole series of questions that cannot be answered till we have the texts before us: ex. gr. are the five acts interpolated between Acts 14 and 15 unauthorized? Are they the work of Alonso de Proaza? And a number of others immediately arise, equally difficult to answer.

In the meantime, I confess, that personally, I am inclined to believe in the genuineness of the edition of Burgos, 1499, until better proof of its falsity is adduced. Of course, nothing can be said with any certainty till these three copies in sixteen Acts are carefully scrutinized and compared.

The Bibliography which Señor Krapf has compiled, is an excellent one, and also contains a review of the principal translations of the *Celestina*, the whole done with great care. The second volume concludes with the Latin

⁸ I have not seen this edition, but as has been observed above, the whole aspect of the bibliography of the *Celestina* has been considerably changed by the investigations of M. Foulché-Delbosc.

text of the *Pamphilus de Amore* and an *Advertencia* by Menéndez y Pelayo.

In conclusion I may say that Señor Krapf has done excellent service to the cause of Spanish literature by giving to students at once the best and by far the handsomest edition of the *Celestina* that has yet appeared. To read, for example, the 1599 Plantiniana, and then turn to this Vigo edition, we can appreciate the boon the publisher has conferred upon us.

Let us hope that students of Spanish literature will now avail themselves of this beautiful edition of the *Celestina*, and that it may find the wide circle of readers that it so well deserves.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Ioannes Nicolai Secundus: Basia. Mit einer Auswahl aus den Vorbildern und Nachahmern herausgegeben von GEORG ELLINGER. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1899. 12mo, lii+38. (Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben von Max Hermann. 14.)

BASIA, the cycle of poems which Joannes Nicolai Secundus wrote on the ever interesting subject of kisses, has found a new and very able editor Mr. Georg Ellinger.

Contrary to the principles established for the *Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler*, the text follows B, the edition of 1541, as the *editio princeps*, a print of 1539, was made from an incomplete and careless copy of the poems. The text of the reprint agrees, therefore, was Bosscha's edition of Secundus' works, except in a few passages stated on page xlvii.

Mr. Ellinger has greatly enhanced the value of his work by adding a selection of the Neo-Latin models and imitations of the Dutch poet, and by offering much information about the history of *Basia*.

The first chapter of the introduction treats of the models for the cycle. These are found not only in certain poems of the Greek Anthology and in two poems of Catullus, but also in the poetry of the Humanists. And it is the merit of the editor to have pointed out for the